

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-23 and 25-36 are pending in this application.

By this Amendment, claims 1 and 14 are amended, and claim 36 is added, to recite additional features disclosed in the specification at, for example, Figs. 4B and 5B; page 41, line 12 - page 42, line 14; and page 44, line 21 - page 45, line 14. Claims 3-5 and 7 are amended in view of the amendments made to claim 1.

Claim 16 is amended to incorporate the subject matter of claim 24. Claim 24 is canceled.

Formal drawings are submitted to replace the originally filed informal drawings. No new matter is added.

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicant thanks Examiner Do for the courtesy extended to Applicant's representative, Mr. Luo, during the April 25, 2006 personal interview. The substance of the personal interview is incorporated in the following remarks.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge consideration of the references listed on, and to return an initialed copy of, the Form PTO-1449 filed with the January 27, 2006 Information Disclosure Statement.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to acknowledge receipt of the certified copy of the Priority Document submitted November 12, 2003.

The Office Action rejects claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over EP 0259144 to Schmitt et al. ("Schmitt"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Schmitt discloses sensors located along a paper path to detect paper jams. See Figs. 2 and 3; col. 5, lines 17-47; and col. 6, lines 34-40. The signals from the sensors are used to diagnose fault related to paper jams along the paper path. Schmitt does not disclose or suggest detection of errors other than paper jams. Schmitt does not disclose or suggest

different types of errors, much less storing data of type of errors with time data. Therefore, as discussed during the personal interview, Schmitt does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 14.

Furthermore, Schmitt only discloses providing paper jam signals. Schmitt does not disclose or suggest supplying operational signals and storing operational signals with time data in addition to detection signals. Thus, as discussed during the personal interview, Schmitt does not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claim 16.

In particular, as discussed during the personal interview, the Office Action's rejection of claim 24 is inaccurate. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that Schmitt discloses operation signals from sensors S1 - S5. However, as discussed during the personal interview, Schmitt's sensors S1 - S5 only detect the presence of a paper sheet, but are not used to operate any operating member. Thus, Schmitt does not disclose the subject matter originally recited in claim 24 and currently recited in claim 16.

For at least the above reasons, Schmitt does not disclose each and every element recited in claims 1, 14 and 16, and claims 2-13, 15, 17-23 and 25-35 depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 6-8 and 11-21 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claim 5 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Schmitt in view of JP-A-57139765 to Masakiyo ("Masakiyo"); rejects claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Schmitt in view of EP 0685818 to Kagita ("Kagita"); and rejects claims 22-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Schmitt in view of U.S. Patent 5,790,779 to Ben-Natan et al. ("Ben-Natan"). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Masakiyo, Kagita and Ben-Natan do not supply the subject matter lacking in Schmitt. Hence, Schmitt, Masakiyo, Kagita and Ben-Natan, either individually or in combination, do not disclose or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1, 14 and 16, and claims 5, 9, 10,

22, 23 and 25-35, depending therefrom. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 9, 10, 22, 23 and 25-35 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

Claim 36 is patentable at least in view of the patentability of claim 16, from which it depends, as well as for additional features it recites. For example, as discussed above, the applied references do not disclose or suggest data of the type of an error, much less storing data of the type of error in association with time data, as recited in claim 36.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-23 and 25-36 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo  
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/sqb

Attachments:

Formal Drawings  
Petition for Extension of Time

Date: May 1, 2006

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p><b>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION</b> Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached formal drawings replace the originally filed informal drawings.

Attachment: Formal Drawings